

## CYPRESS POINT PROJECT POLICY CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

---

The following assessment was prepared for San Mateo County and the Coastal Commission, and provides a discussion of the relationship of the proposed project to the policies and procedures of the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program, the San Mateo County Zoning Ordinance, the California Coastal Act, and the Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan.

Because compliance or noncompliance with adopted plans and policies does not in itself result in a physical impact to the environment, no environmental impacts are identified in this analysis; rather, the evaluation concentrates on the proposed project's compliance with adopted policy. Where a policy regulates or sets standards for an aspect of the environment, for instance in setting flood proofing standards for areas subject to 100-year frequency floods, the impact is identified and evaluated in the appropriate technical report prepared for the proposed project, and these agency policies are used as environmental standards in evaluating specific environmental impacts in those documents.

This version of the Policy Consistency Analysis report provides updates to the April 2019 version in order to include changes to the project made by MidPen in response to comments from community members. These changes include:

- Increasing the minimum setback of buildings from the property line adjacent to Carlos Street to 20 feet;
- Reducing the maximum height of all buildings to 28 feet;
- Re-routing the pedestrian path providing access to Sierra Street.

Other minor changes to the text have been made to correct errors, improve readability, and ensure consistency among reports. None of these changes resulted in any changes to impact conclusions or mitigation measures.

### **1. SAN MATEO COUNTY LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM**

In late 1980, the County Board of Supervisors and the California Coastal Commission approved the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP). In April 1981, the County assumed responsibility for implementing the State Coastal Act in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County, including issuance of Coastal Development Permits. The current LCP (June 2013) contains all LCP policies, with amendments approved through August 8, 2012. All development in the Coastal Zone requires either a Coastal Development Permit or an exemption from Coastal Development Permit requirements. For a permit to be issued, the development must comply with the policies of the LCP and those ordinances adopted to implement the LCP. These policies have been adopted by reference into the County's Zoning Regulations under Chapter 20B, Section 6328.19 through 6328.30.



# Coastal Commission Review Draft

The following discussion evaluates the consistency of the proposed MidPen Housing project with relevant San Mateo County LCP policies. Table 1 lists the relevant LCP policies, the consistency of the proposed affordable housing project with each policy, and the reasoning for the consistency conclusions.

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b>LOCATING AND PLANNING NEW DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT</b>		
<b>Development Review</b>		
<b>1.1 Coastal Development Permits</b> After certification of the Local Coastal Program (LCP), require a Coastal Development Permit for all development in the Coastal Zone subject to certain exemptions.	Yes	After San Mateo County completes the process of requesting the Coastal Commission to amend the LCP to accommodate the zoning required for the proposed project, MidPen will apply for a Coastal Development Permit from San Mateo County.
<b>1.5 Land Uses and Development Densities in Urban Areas</b>  b. Permit in urban areas land uses designated on the LCP Land Use Plan Map and conditional uses up to the densities specified in Tables 1.2 and 1.3. The use and amount of development allowed on a parcel, including parcels in areas designated "General Open Space," "Agriculture," or "Public Recreation-Community Park" on the General Plan Land Use Map within the urban boundary in the Coastal Zone, shall be limited to the uses and to the amount, density and size of development permitted by the Local Coastal Program, including the density credit requirements of Policy 1.8c and Table 1.3.	Yes	The project site is currently designated as Medium-High Density Residential (for both the General Plan and the LCP), and the zoning designation is PUD-124/CD. The proposed project would develop 71 units at a density of 6.5 units per acre, which is below the allowable densities under the existing General Plan, LCP, and zoning designations (see Section 1.3.3 of the Project Description). As part of the project, the County is requesting that the LCP be amended to change the site zoning designation from Medium-High Density Residential to Medium Density Residential, which allows for development at densities of between 6.1 and 8.0 housing units per acre. The proposed General Plan Amendment will change to project site designation from Medium-High Density Residential to Medium Density Residential, which allows for development at densities of between 6.1 and 8.7 housing units per acre. The project also includes an amendment of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning to accommodate the proposed project density. The proposed residential project is an allowable land use within existing and proposed land use designations.
<b>Growth Management</b>		
<b>1.17 Existing Developed Areas</b> Conserve, improve, and revitalize existing residential, commercial and industrial areas.	Yes	The proposed project would involve the construction of 71 units of new affordable housing at a density similar to the surrounding neighborhood. It would not remove any residential, commercial, or industrial uses. It may benefit commercial uses by adding population and thus increasing demand for commercial uses in the neighborhood.

**Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies**

Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p><b>1.18 Location of New Development</b></p> <p>a. Direct new development to existing urban areas and rural service centers in order to: (1) discourage urban sprawl, (2) maximize the efficiency of public facilities, services, and utilities, (3) minimize energy consumption, (4) encourage the orderly formation and development of local governmental agencies, (5) protect and enhance the natural environment, and (6) revitalize existing developed areas.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project is an affordable housing project located in an existing urban area, is proposed on a parcel designated for affordable housing in the LCP, and is being developed at a relatively high density (6.5 units/acre) that matches the existing neighborhood around it. The project site is within an existing neighborhood served by public facilities and services, including water, sewer, gas, and electricity, fire, sheriff, hospitals, and schools. Further, the affordable housing units planned for the project site qualify as a priority use in the LCP, and both water supply and wastewater capacity have been reserved for the project. The project will not have any significant impacts on coastal resources with adoption of the recommended mitigation measures, as documented in the Biological Resources Report (De Novo 2020), Cultural Resources Report (Stevens Consulting 2018a), and Aesthetics and Visual Resources Report (Stevens Consulting 2020a). In addition, the project will protect and enhance the natural environment by clustering development on a portion of the site and preserving approximately half of the site as undeveloped open space.</p>
<p>b. Concentrate new development in urban areas and rural service centers by requiring the “infilling” of existing residential subdivisions and commercial areas.</p>	Yes	<p>As set forth in Section 1.20 of the LCP, infill is defined as “the development of vacant land in urban areas ... which is: (1) subdivided and zoned for development at densities greater than one dwelling unit per 5 acres, and/or (2) served by sewer and water utilities.” Because the proposed project includes a development density of 6.5 units per acre in an existing urban area served by public facilities and services, the proposed project would be considered an infill project.</p>
<p>c. Allow some future growth to develop at relatively high densities for affordable housing in areas where public facilities and services are or will be adequate and where coastal resources will not be endangered.</p>	Yes	<p>See response to 1.18.a above.</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p><b>1.19 Ensure Adequate Public Services and Infrastructure for New Development in Urban Areas</b></p> <p>No permit for development in the urban area shall be approved unless it can be demonstrated that it will be served with adequate water supplies and wastewater treatment facilities, consistent with the subsections below:</p> <p>a. Development that relies upon municipal water and wastewater treatment systems shall not be approved, except as provided in the subsections below, if there is: (a) insufficient water and wastewater public works capacity within the system to serve the development given the already outstanding commitments by the service provider or (b) evidence that the entity providing the service cannot provide such service for the development.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project site is within the service area of the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD). Per LCP Policy 3.12, the affordable housing units planned for the project site qualify as a priority use as described in the 2013 San Mateo County LCP, and therefore the water demand and sewer capacity will be supplied by MWSD’s priority use reserves for affordable housing. The project site is specifically listed in the LCP as “North Moss Beach Site (11 acres)” in <i>Table 2.7: Sewage Treatment Capacity to be Reserved for Priority Land Uses-Montara Sanitary District</i>, and <i>Table 2.17: Amount of Water Capacity to be Reserved for Priority Land Uses-Montara Water and Sewer District</i>.</p>
<p>c. New public water connections in the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) water service area will be allowed only if consistent with the MWSD Public Works Plan (Coastal Commission PWP No. 2-06-006), Chapter 2 of the LCP, and all other applicable policies of the LCP as amended.</p>	Yes	<p>The Coastal Commission staff report on the MWSD Public Works Plan (PWP) confirms that “the PWP would protect all LCP-enumerated priority uses,” including the proposed affordable housing project (Coastal Commission 2013). Thus, the proposed project is consistent with the PMP. The consistency of the proposed project with applicable policies of the LCP is evaluated throughout Table 1.</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p><b>1.23 Timing of New Housing Development in the Midcoast</b></p> <p>a. In order to ensure that roads, utilities, schools and other public works facilities and community infrastructure are not overburdened by rapid residential growth, limit the maximum number of new dwelling units built in the urban Midcoast to 40 units each calendar year until:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. A comprehensive transportation management plan, as described in Policy 2.53, is incorporated into the LCP;</li> <li>ii. Facilities to adequately contain stormwater infiltration and inflow that exceed the existing Intertie Pipeline System (IPS) capacity during storm events and peak flows have been constructed and sufficient evidence has been presented that IPS capacity is adequate to avoid sewage overflows and water quality violations; and</li> <li>iii. The growth rate is changed by an LCP amendment.</li> </ul> <p>b. New dwelling units include each new single-family residential unit, each new unit in a two-family dwelling, each new unit in a multiple-family residential development, each new unit in mixed-use development, each new caretaker quarter, each new affordable housing unit, and each new second dwelling unit as further defined in 'd'.</p> <p>c. The number of each dwelling units built each year means that the number of units for which building permits have been issued authorizing construction to commence. The date of building permit issuance does not relate to the date of building permit application.</p>	<p>Yes (if MidPen's request is approved)</p>	<p>MidPen has requested that the County concur with their conclusion that the proposed project meets the requirements provided in Policy 1.23, Section (d), and should thus be exempted from the requirements contained in Policy 1.23. The project would provide affordable housing and it is likely that the growth rate over a three-year period would not exceed 40 units per year. In addition, the proposed project includes HydroModification features to ensure that post-project stormwater runoff does not exceed pre-project levels. With the County's approval of MidPen's request, the project would be consistent with this policy.</p>

<b>Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies</b>		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p>d. If the number of issued building permits for any given year has reached the 40-unit maximum, building permits for affordable housing, including second dwelling units, may still be issued under the following circumstances: (1) the units are “affordable” as defined by Section 6102.48.6 of the certified zoning regulations and subject to income and cost/rent restrictions for the life of the development; and (2) the growth rate average over the three-year period, that includes the year of building permit issuance and the following two years, does not exceed 40 units/year.</p> <p>e. This annual limit on residential units is not an entitlement, i.e., it does not guarantee that any proposed development will be approved. A coastal development permit for residential units may only be approved if the proposed development can be found consistent with all applicable policies of the certified LCP.</p>		
<p><b>1.25 Protection of Archaeological/Paleontological Resources</b></p> <p>Based on County Archaeology /Paleontology Sensitivity Maps, determine whether or not sites proposed for new development are located within areas containing potential archaeological/paleontological resources. Prior to approval of development proposed in sensitive areas, require that a mitigation plan, adequate to protect the resource and prepared by a qualified archaeologist/paleontologist be submitted for review and approval and implemented as part of the project.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>As indicated in the Cultural Resource Report prepared for the Cypress Point project (Stevens Consulting 2018a), the project site does contain one potential archaeological resource. The County of San Mateo Planning Department was contacted to obtain copies of sensitivity maps for archaeological and paleontological resources, as required by Local Coastal Program Policy 1.25. However, the County did not have copies of these maps. Surveys of the project site were conducted by Archaeological Resources Management (ARM), which noted:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“A small area of prehistoric shell midden was noted during surface reconnaissance. The midden was sparse, and surface elements consisted of a scatter of Mytilus (Mussel) shell fragments.</p> <p>Subsequently, an archaeological testing program was conducted at the midden site (given the trinomial CA-SMA-431) that concluded:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Based upon the results of the hand excavation, it appears that this deposit is highly disturbed and possibly imported from outside the proposed</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
		<p>project area during modern dumping activities. The midden material is not significant enough to warrant preservation, however it may contain significant isolated artifacts/remains and any construction activities carried out within the vicinity of the site should be monitored by an archaeologist.</p> <p>The Cultural Resources Report determined that the construction of project buildings on and adjacent to this midden site would be a significant impact. A paleontological resources review of the project site was also conducted, which determined that the site may be sensitive for paleontological resources.</p> <p>The following summarizes the mitigation measures recommended to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct additional testing of the midden site to collect data on any resources present at the site, and catalogue and store all resources obtained from the site (CUL-1);</li> <li>• Conduct monitoring of construction on the project site (CUL-2),</li> <li>• Specify actions to be taken to protect resources if any are identified during construction (CUL-3);</li> <li>• Prepare a paleontological resource monitoring plan and conduct pedestrian surveys for paleontological resources on the project site (CUL-4); and</li> <li>• Implement procedures for handling any human remains that may be discovered during project construction (CUL-5).</li> </ul> <p>In summary, the entire site was evaluated for archaeological, historic, and paleontological resources, and although no eligible sites were found, reasonable measures were adopted to protect any previously undiscovered resources during construction of the project.</p>
<b>PUBLIC WORKS</b>		
<b>General Policies</b>		
<b>2.8 Reservation of Capacity for Priority Land Uses</b>	Yes	The proposed project will rely exclusively on public water and sewer service from the Montara Water and Sanitary District. Per its public works plan as approved by the Coastal Commission, MWSD has
a. Reserve public works capacity for land uses given priority by the Local Coastal		



Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
Program as shown on Table 2.7 and Table 2.17. All priority land uses shall exclusively rely on public sewer and water services.		reserved capacity for the priority land uses listed in Tables 2.7 and 2.17 of the LCP. The proposed project is located on a parcel designated as the LCP Program Priority “North Moss Beach Site” in both Table 2.7 (for sewage treatment capacity) and 2.17 (for water supply capacity). The reservation for both sewage treatment and water service is based on the current zoning which allows 148 units. As discussed under Policy 1.5 above, the proposed project would develop 71 units at a density of 6.5 units per acre, which is below the allowable densities under the existing General Plan, LCP, and zoning designations. Because the proposed project would be developed at a density less than what is anticipated by the LCP, the water and sewer demand is within the projections of reserved capacity set forth in Tables 2.7 and 2.17.
<b>Sewers</b>		
<b>2.16 Reservation of Capacity for Priority Land Uses</b> a. Reserve sewage treatment capacity for each land use given priority by the Coastal Act or the Local Coastal Program. These priority uses are shown on Table 2.7. Amend this table to reflect all changes in the Land Use Plan which affect these priority land uses.	Yes	As indicated in the discussion for Policy 2.8 above, the Cypress Point project would provide affordable housing, which is specifically listed as an LCP priority land use in Tables 2.7 and 2.17 in the LCP. Also, the project would be developed at a density less than what is anticipated by the LCP.
b. Where existing or planned sewage treatment facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to Coastal Act priority uses listed on Table 2.7 shall have priority over Local Coastal Program priority uses listed on Table 2.7.	Yes	The Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside has indicated that the wastewater treatment system has adequate capacity for growth anticipated in the region, including the proposed project.
<b>MidCoast Water Supply</b>		
<b>2.24 Reservation of Capacity for Priority Land Uses</b> a. Reserve water supplies for each land use given priority by the Coastal Act or the Local Coastal Program. These priority uses are shown on Table 2.17. Amend this table to reflect all changes in the Land Use Plan which affect these land uses.	Yes	As indicated in the discussion for Policy 2.8 above, the Cypress Point project would provide affordable housing, which is specifically listed as an LCP priority land use in Tables 2.7 and 2.17 in the LCP. Also, the project would be developed at a density less than what is anticipated by the LCP.

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b>Roads</b>		
<p><b>2.42 Capacity Limits</b></p> <p>a. Limit expansion of roadways to capacity which does not exceed that needed to accommodate commuter peak period traffic when buildout of the Land Use Plan occurs and which does not exceed existing and probable future capacity of water and sewage treatment and transmission capacity or otherwise conflict with other policies of the LCP.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project does not propose any changes to the capacity of any roadways, including State Route (SR) 1. While improvements to the intersections of some local streets with SR 1 are proposed as part of the project, these proposed changes are intended to improve the level of service of vehicles approaching SR 1 from the local streets, not the capacity of SR 1. As indicated in the assessment of consistency with Policies 2.16 and 2.24, the Cypress Point project is a priority land use under the LCP for which sewage treatment and water supply capacity has been reserved.</p>
<p><b>2.43 Desired Level of Service</b></p> <p>In assessing the need for road expansion, consider Service Level D acceptable during commuter peak periods and Service Level E acceptable during recreation peak periods.</p>	Yes	<p>The traffic study prepared for the proposed project (Kittelson 2019) uses the following standard for assessing the need for improvements to local traffic facilities:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The minimum acceptable design level of service (LOS) in the County is ‘C’. At intersections, analyses should show an overall LOS of ‘C’ with no individual movement operating at less than ‘D’ to be considered acceptable and not require mitigation measures. On occasion, level of service ‘D’ may be allowed for peak periods in dense urban condition per County’s discretion.</p> <p>The traffic study used a more stringent LOS standard than that indicated in Policy 2.43 for the analysis of both commuter peak hour (a.m. and p.m. peak hours) and recreational peak hour (summer) conditions. The study does not identify the need for any roadway expansions, but does recommend improvements to several intersections based on the LOS for the stop-controlled legs at several intersections. None of these recommendations was based on the LOS during recreational peak periods alone.</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p><b>2.44 Route 1 and Route 92 Phase I Capacity Limits</b></p> <p>b. On Route 1, limit improvements to: (1) slow vehicle lanes on uphill grades and the following operational and safety improvements within the existing alignment or lands immediately adjacent: elimination of sharp curves, lane widening, lane reconfiguration, acceleration/deceleration lanes, wider shoulders to allow passage for bicycles, emergency vehicles and signals at major intersections; (2) additional traffic lanes in the Midcoast project area as depicted on Map 1.3, provided the additional lanes are found to be in compliance with all other applicable policies of the LCP, including, but not limited to, sensitive habitat and wetland protection policies; and (3) construction of a tunnel for motorized vehicles only behind Devil’s Slide through San Pedro Mountain.</p> <p>The tunnel design shall be consistent with (a) Coastal Act limits restricting Route 1 to a two-lane scenic highway, and (b) minimum State and federal tunnel standards. A separate trail for pedestrians and bicycles shall be provided outside the tunnel as specified in Policy 2.50a and 2.50b.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>While improvements to the intersections of some local streets with SR 1 are proposed as part of the Cypress Point project, these proposed changes are intended to improve the safety and level of service of vehicles approaching SR 1 from the local streets, not to increase the capacity of SR 1. Other improvements may be made to improve safety for automobiles and pedestrians, but these also would not improve the capacity of SR 1. Further, these improvements, including changes in allowable turning movements from side streets and improvements to intersection control fall within the improvements allowed under Policy 2.44.b.</p>
<p><b>2.48 Roadway Alignments</b></p> <p>b. Require that the roadway improvements be consistent with all applicable policies of the Local Coastal Program, including, but not limited to, the Sensitive Habitats and Agriculture Components.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Proposed roadway improvements include changes to the intersections of some local streets, subject to Caltrans approval. The consistency of the proposed project with applicable policies of the LCP is evaluated in this Table 1, including with applicable policies from Sensitive Habitats and Agriculture Components as discussed below.</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p><b>2.52 Traffic Mitigation for all Development in the Urban Midcoast</b></p> <p>In the urban Midcoast, require applicants for new development, as defined in Section 30106 of the Coastal Act, that generates any net increase in vehicle trips on Highways 1 and/or 92, except for a single-family dwelling, a second dwelling unit, or a two-family dwelling, to develop and implement a traffic impact analysis and mitigation plan (TIMP). Prior to the approval of any coastal development permit (CDP) application involving the above, information necessary for the analysis and implementation of all components of the TIMP shall be submitted in support of any CDP application. Calculation of new vehicle trips generated shall assume maximum occupancy/use of any approved development. The TIMP shall include:</p> <p>a. Traffic mitigation measures, including but not limited to transportation demand management (TDM) measures set forth by the City/County Association of Governments (CCAG), establishing a shuttle service for employees of the subject development, subsidizing transit for employees of the specific development, charging for non-public access parking, establishing a carpool or vanpooling program for employees of the subject development, having a compressed work week for employees of the subject development, providing bicycle storage facilities and showers for employees of the subject development, and establishing a day care program for employees of the subject development. Prior to approval of the coastal development permit, the County must be able to make the finding that the proposed mitigation measures are adequate to offset new vehicle trips generated by the project to the extent feasible.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>A Traffic Impact Analysis (Kittelson 2019) was prepared for the Cypress Point project, which analyzed the impacts of the proposed development on 10 intersections in the vicinity of the project site, as directed by San Mateo County. The traffic study includes a list of potential improvements that may be required by the County for the proposed project, including optional improvements to intersections (closure of SR 1/Carlos Street intersection except to emergency vehicles, connect it to 16<sup>th</sup> Street, or re-grade the east side of SR 1 to improve site distance); improve intersection control at the SR 1/California Avenue/Wienke Way intersection), to transit service (rerouting of transit service to improve safety and access), and to pedestrian safety (provision of sidewalks). The traffic study also includes a mitigation measure requiring MidPen to prepare a TDM plan for review and approval by San Mateo County, and includes examples of measures to be included in the plan. The proposed project is not yet at the stage of approval where it is applying for a CDP. When MidPen does apply for a CDP, they will work with the County, and perhaps Caltrans, to clarify the details of the required improvements.</p>

<b>Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies</b>		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p>b. Specific provisions to assess, and mitigate for, the project’s significant adverse cumulative impacts on public access to, and recreational use of, the beaches of the Midcoast region of San Mateo County. This shall include an assessment of project impacts combined with other projects causing related impacts, including all reasonably foreseeable future projects as defined in 14 CCR Section 15130(b). Public access and recreation mitigation measures to consider include: providing public access parking that is not time restricted, public access signage indicating that public access parking is available, providing a public recreation shuttle bus to all the beaches during key recreational use times that commences at the junction of Highways 92 and 280, dedication of construction of various public access improvements such as bikeways, and vertical and lateral public paths to and along the beaches and/or bluffs.</p>	Yes	<p>The proposed project would not have any adverse effects on access to beaches or other shore areas, as it is located on the inland side of SR 1.</p>
<b>HOUSING</b>		
<b>General Policies</b>		
<p><b>3.1 Sufficient Housing Opportunities</b> Through both public and private efforts, protect, encourage and, where feasible, provide housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income who reside, work or can be expected to work in the MidCoast region.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project would provide 71 new affordable housing units in the MidCoast region. Although access to these units cannot by law be restricted to residents of the MidCoast region, MidPen will give priority to qualifying renters who live and/or work in the region for 75% of the units.</p>
<p><b>3.2 Non-Discrimination</b> Strive to ensure that decent housing is available for low and moderate income persons regardless of age, race, sex, marital status or other arbitrary factors.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project will provide affordable housing for low-income persons (defined as up to 80% of the local area median income (AMI)). MidPen does not discriminate in selecting renters due to age, sex, marital status, or other arbitrary factors. The project will be designed to serve residents of all backgrounds, with multiple unit types offered (one, two and three bedroom) to provide housing for different size households. The development will include mobility features in at least ten percent of units and communications features in at least four percent of units to assist people with mobility, vision, and hearing impairments.</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p><b>3.3 Balanced Developments</b></p> <p>Strive to provide such housing in balanced residential environments that combine access to employment, community facilities and adequate services.</p>	Yes	<p>MidPen is proposing the Cypress Point project to provide affordable housing in the only location specifically zoned for this purpose and available to MidPen. A portion of or units in the project will include a preference for households who already live or work in the region. The project site is located in Moss Beach, designated as an urban area in Policy 1.4 of the LCP. Community facilities and services are available nearby in Moss Beach, Montara, El Granada, Princeton, Miramar, and Half Moon Bay.</p> <p>According to census data compiled in 2016, the three adjacent communities of Montara, Moss Beach, and El Granada – all of which are within 6 miles of the project site – contain 1,364 jobs. The project is within ½ mile of the Coastside Market grocery and Moss Beach Park. It is within 1.4 miles of Farallone View Elementary School, and 1.2 miles of the Seton Coastside Medical Center.</p>
<p><b>3.4 Diverse Housing Opportunities</b></p> <p>Strive to improve the range of housing choices, by location, type, price and tenure, available to persons of low and moderate income.</p>	Yes	<p>There is currently no income-restricted affordable housing in the MidCoast region. The Cypress Point project would provide 71 new housing units in the MidCoast region for persons of low income, and would thus improve the range of housing choices available on the MidCoast for this demographic.</p>
<p><b><i>Encouragement and Provision of New Housing Opportunities for Low and Moderate Income Households</i></b></p>		
<p><b>3.12 Reservation of Water and Sewer Capacity</b></p> <p>a. Designate affordable housing and designated family farm labor housing sites as a priority land use for which water and sewer capacity will be reserved in accordance with the policies of the Public Works Component. Where a portion of a site (i.e., North Moss Beach site) is required to provide affordable housing, consider the entire development proposed on the site as a priority land use for which water and sewer capacity will be reserved.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project is located on the parcel designated as North Moss Beach site in the LCP and would provide affordable housing. While the current zoning allows for affordable housing and market rate housing, the Cypress Point project would provide affordable housing exclusively, apart from a resident manager’s unit. Thus, water and sewer capacity are reserved for this project.</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p><b>3.13 Maintenance of Community Character</b></p> <p>Require that new development providing significant housing opportunities for low and moderate income persons contribute to maintaining a sense of community character by being of compatible scale, size and design. Limit the height to two stories to mitigate the impact of this development on the surrounding neighborhoods. Assess negative traffic impacts and mitigate as much as possible.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project would provide affordable housing opportunities for low income persons. It has been designed to provide an overall density and maximum building heights similar to the surrounding neighborhood, and, with regard to density, much less than allowed under current zoning. The project is limited to two story structures that would be subject to future design review; the project will comply with all applicable design standards and guidelines.</p> <p>MidPen has prepared a traffic impact study (Kittelson 2019) that analyses the effects of the proposed project on the transportation system, including 10 intersections within Moss Beach. The project will clarify the improvements that are required when it applies for a Coastal Development Permit, and will implement all mitigation measures required by the relevant agencies having jurisdiction over project approval.</p>
<p><b>3.14 Location of Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>a. Midcoast: Locate affordable housing in the following locations:</p> <p>(1) All designated affordable housing sites in the urban area (within the urban boundary) defined in the Locating and Planning New Development Component.</p> <p>(2) Elsewhere in the urban area, where affordable housing units specified in LCP Policies 3.19, 3.20, 3.21 and 3.22 are permitted, including mobile homes, second units, and affordable units derived from density bonus provisions.</p> <p>(3) In the rural area (outside the urban boundary), affordable housing units as specified in LCP Policies 3.23 and 3.24.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project is located in the Urban Area on the parcel designated as the North Moss Beach affordable housing site in the LCP.</p>
<p><b>3.15 Designated Affordable Housing Sites</b></p> <p>a. Designate the following as potential sites where affordable housing would be feasibly provided when residential development occurs: (1) The 11-acre site in North Moss Beach.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project is located on the parcel designated as the North Moss Beach affordable housing site in the LCP.</p>



Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
b. Designate these sites Medium High Density to incorporate a density bonus within the land use designation.	Yes	The project parcel is already zoned for PUD, and MidPen is not requesting that to be changed. It is requesting that the General Plan, LCP, and zoning for the site be changed to Medium Density, to accommodate the requests from neighbors. With these changes, the project will be consistent with all land use designations. MidPen is not requesting a density bonus for the proposed project, and is in fact requesting a change to the zoning for the site to allow a lower density of development to respond to concerns from neighbors.
c. Rezone the designated sites or other appropriate sites within the urban boundary to the PUD zone to allow flexible residential development standards, when appropriate in conjunction with development plan approval.	Yes	See response to Policy 3.15.b above.
d. Evaluate proposals to develop the designated or other appropriate sites according to the following criteria:  (1) For the total 11-acre North Moss Beach site, development must help meet LCP housing objectives by meeting the following criteria:  (a) Twenty-one percent (21%) of the total units constructed on the site are reserved for low income households.  (b) In addition to the required low income units, fourteen percent (14%) of the total units constructed are reserved for moderate income households.	Yes (if policy is modified)	The Cypress Point project would provide 71 new affordable housing units in the MidCoast region. All of the units, except for the manager’s apartment, will be reserved for low-income persons (defined as households earning up to 80% of the AMI).  Because 100% of the units would be low-income housing, which exceeds the total proportion of affordable housing required in Policy 3.15(d) of 35%, the project would significantly exceed the units envisioned in the policy.  MidPen is requesting that this policy be modified to more closely reflect the objectives of the proposed project. If this policy is modified as requested, the project will be consistent with this policy.
(3) Development must comply with all of the regulations established for Structural and Community Features (Urban), as established in the Visual Resources Component.	Yes	MidPen prepared an Aesthetics Report that assesses the impacts of the proposed project on visual resources (Stevens Consulting 2020a), and concluded that the proposed project would not have any significant adverse effects related to visual resources. The consistency of the proposed project with policies contained in the Visual Resources Component of the LCP is discussed below under <i>Visual Resources</i> .
(4) Require the provision of amenities including, but not limited to, landscaping and recreation facilities.	Yes	The project includes landscaping, a community garden, a children’s play area, BBQ areas, and a public trail through a portion of the site. The trail will provide information recreational opportunities to both residents and the general public.



Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
(5) Encourage the provision of community services, such as day care centers.	Yes	The proposed project includes community amenities as described above. In addition, residents will have the opportunity to take advantage of multiple services including after-school programs for children, adult education and training, and connections to a variety of social services providers in the area
<p><b>3.16 Phasing the Development of Designated Housing Sites</b></p> <p>a. Limit the number of affordable housing units given building permits for construction on the designated sites to 60 during any 12-month period in order to allow the affordable housing units constructed on the designated housing sites to be assimilated into the community a few at a time.</p> <p>b. Allow the County Board of Supervisors to increase the number of affordable housing units permitted if they make the finding that the above phasing requirement threatens the implementation of affordable housing on a designated site by prohibiting the developer(s) from building when circumstances are uniquely favorable for a limited period of time (i.e., low interest rate financing or public subsidies are available).</p>	Yes (if the County agrees with MidPen’s request)	The requirement in Policy 3.16(a) limits the number of building permits issued for affordable housing units to 60 in any 12-month period. MidPen has requested that the County concur with their conclusion that this limitation would “threaten the implementation of affordable housing”. The significant challenges of financing and constructing affordable housing, which include continued escalation of construction costs in the Bay Area, increases in interest rates over time, a shifting financial environment, and limited income from rental units, means that requiring the project to be approved and built over two years would significantly increase costs and jeopardize feasibility. Also, tight project deadlines and high competition for tax credit financing would not allow the project to be developed in two phases.
<p><b>3.20 Grant Density Bonuses for the Development of Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>In accordance with State Government Code Section 65915, or any successor statute, grant a density bonus of 25% and other incentive(s) for the development of new housing in the urban area if a developer agrees to construct: (a) 10% of the housing units for very low income households, or (b) 20% of the housing units for lower income households, or (c) 50% of the housing units for senior households. Also, grant a supplemental density bonus if a development exceeds the minimum requirements stated above, or provides a percentage of the total units for large families or disabled households.</p>	Yes	The Cypress Point project would provide affordable housing opportunities for low-income persons. It has been designed to provide an overall density similar to the surrounding neighborhood, and much less than allowable under current zoning. Although it would be eligible for a density bonus under Policy 3.20, MidPen is not requesting a density bonus in order to design a project that fits with the character of the existing community.

**Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies**

Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p><b>3.21 Establish an Inclusionary Requirement for Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>Establish an inclusionary requirement for affordable housing whereby residential developments, including land divisions in urban areas will be required to either (a) reserve a percentage of the units constructed as affordable housing, OR (b) pay a fee in lieu of constructing the required affordable housing units. Assure continued affordability of reserved affordable housing units through appropriate deed restrictions.</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project will provide 71 units, all of which (except for the manager’s unit) will be affordable to persons of low income. The project site is specifically designated for the purpose of providing low income housing. The continued use of these units as affordable housing at this location is required by the project funding sources, in addition to County requirements.</p>
<b>ENERGY</b>		
No policies pertain to the proposed project.		
<b>AGRICULTURE COMPONENT</b>		
No policies pertain to the proposed project.		
<b>AQUACULTURE</b>		
No policies pertain to the proposed project.		
<b>SENSITIVE HABITATS</b>		
<i>General Policies</i>		
<p><b>7.3 Protection of Sensitive Habitats</b></p> <p>a. Prohibit any land use or development which would have significant adverse impacts on sensitive habitat areas.</p>	Yes	<p>MidPen prepared a biological resources report (De Novo 2020) that evaluated the biological resources on the project site. The report concluded that the project site is not designated as a sensitive habitat area and does not contain any sensitive habitat areas. Thus, the proposed project would not have any adverse impacts on such areas.</p>
<p>b. Development in areas adjacent to sensitive habitats shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts that could significantly degrade the sensitive habitats. All uses shall be compatible with the maintenance of biologic productivity of the habitats.</p>	Yes	<p>The northern portion of the project site drains to Montara Creek, which is a sensitive habitat area, but this portion of the site would not be developed and the project will meet County stormwater requirements, as described in the Hydromodification Management memo (BKF 2018), so it will result in no changes to the quantity or quality of runoff to the creek. Thus, any impacts to the creek would be only minor.</p>
<p><b>7.5 Permit Conditions</b></p> <p>a. As part of the development review process, require the applicant to demonstrate that there will be no significant impact on sensitive habitats. When it is determined that significant</p>	Yes	<p>MidPen prepared a biological resources report (De Novo 2020) that evaluated the biological resources on the project site. The report concluded that the site does not contain any designated sensitive habitat areas. However, the report identified potential impacts to nesting raptors that could occur during</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
impacts may occur, require the applicant to provide a report prepared by a qualified professional which provides: (1) mitigation measures which protect resources and comply with the policies of the Shoreline Access, Recreation/Visitor-Serving Facilities and Sensitive Habitats Components, and (2) a program for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of mitigation measures. Develop an appropriate program to inspect the adequacy of the applicant's mitigation measures.		construction. Even though no raptors have been identified on the project site, the forested areas in the northern portion of the site could be occupied by raptors during construction. Mitigation measures included in the report would ensure the forested area and any potential raptors in this area are protected from disturbance during construction. The mitigation measures further specify what actions should be taken should any nesting birds be identified. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to nesting raptors would be considered less than significant. The proposed project would not have any effects on shoreline access or visitor-serving facilities.
b. When applicable, require as a condition of permit approval the restoration of damaged habitat(s) when in the judgment of the Planning Director restoration is partially or wholly feasible.	Yes	The proposed project would result in redevelopment of a largely disturbed urban site that has been naturalized to some extent. The parcel does not contain special status species or their habitats and is currently exposed to on-going human presence including some vehicle and pedestrian traffic (hiking/jogging). As discussed above, the forested areas in the northern portion of the site would be protected during construction. Therefore, there would be no damage to habitat that would require restoration.
<b><i>Rare and Endangered Species</i></b>		
<b>7.34 Permit Conditions</b> In addition to the conditions set forth in Policy 7.5, require, prior to permit issuance, that a qualified biologist prepare a report which defines the requirements of rare and endangered organisms. At minimum, require the report to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Discuss:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Animal food, water, nesting or denning sites and reproduction, predation and migration requirements, and</li> <li>(2) Plants life histories and soils, climate and geographic requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Include a map depicting the locations of plants or animals and/or their habitats.</li> <li>c. Demonstrate that any development will not impact the functional capacity of the habitat.</li> </ul>	Yes	As discussed above under Policy 7.5.a, MidPen prepared a biological resources report (De Novo 2020) to the specifications of Policy 7.34 that evaluated the biological resources on the project site. The report concluded that the site does not contain any sensitive habitat areas. Although none were found during surveys, it is possible that some rare or endangered species may be identified prior to or during construction. However, mitigation measures have been proposed that will reduced all impacts to less than significant.

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
d. Recommend mitigation if development is permitted within or adjacent to identified habitats.		
<b>7.35 Preservation of Critical Habitats</b> Require preservation of all habitats of rare and endangered species using criteria including, but not limited to, Section 6325.2 (Primary Fish and Wildlife Habitat Area Criteria) and Section 6325.7 (Primary Natural Vegetative Areas Criteria) of the Resource Management Zoning District.	Yes	As discussed above under Policy 7.5, MidPen prepared a biological resources report (De Novo 2020) that evaluated the biological resources on the project site. The report concluded that the site does not contain any sensitive habitat areas or any critical habitat for rare or endangered species. Further, the project site is not located in a designated Resource Management Zoning District.
<b>7.41 Rare Plant Search</b> Encourage a continued search for any rare plants known to have occurred in San Mateo County Coastal Zone but not recently seen. Such search can be done by various persons or groups concerned with such matters.	Yes	A botanist completed a protocol-level survey of the project site to determine whether rare plant species occur on the project site (De Novo 2020). No rare plants were identified on site, and the project site does not contain the appropriate habitat for the majority of species with potential to occur on the site. For the species with potential to occur, based on the field survey and lack of habitat on the project site, these species were presumed absent.
<b>7.42 Development Standards</b> Prevent any development on or within 50 feet of any rare plant population. When no feasible alternative exists, permit development if: (1) the site or a significant portion thereof is returned to a natural state to allow for the reestablishment of the plant, or (2) a new site is made available for the plant to inhabit.	Yes	See response to policy 7.41 above.
<b><i>Weedy, Undesirable Plants</i></b>		
<b>7.51 Voluntary Cooperation</b> Encourage the voluntary cooperation of private landowners to remove from their lands the undesirable pampas grass, French, Scotch and other invasive brooms. Similarly, encourage landowners to remove blue gum seedlings to prevent their spread.	Yes	No French or Scotch brooms were identified on the project site, but pampas grass was. MidPen has included an Environmental Commitment to remove all pampas grass from the project site.

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b><i>Natural Features - Landforms</i></b>		
<p><b>8.5 Location of Development</b></p> <p>On rural lands and urban parcels larger than 20,000 sq. ft.:</p> <p>a. Require that new development be located on a portion of a parcel where the development: (1) is least visible from State and County Scenic Roads; (2) is least likely to significantly impact views from public viewpoints; and (3) is consistent with all other LCP requirements, best preserves the visual and open space qualities of the parcel overall. Where conflicts in complying with this requirement occur, resolve them in a manner which, on balance, most protects significant coastal resources on the parcel, consistent with Coastal Act Section 30007.5.</p> <p>Public viewpoints include, but are not limited to, coastal roads, roadside rests and vista points, recreation areas, trails, coastal accessways, and beaches.</p> <p>This provision does not apply to enlargement of existing structures, provided that the size of the structure after enlargement does not exceed 150% of the pre-existing floor area, or 2,000 sq. ft., whichever is greater.</p> <p>This provision does not apply to agricultural development to the extent that application of the provision would impair any agricultural use or operation on the parcel. In such cases, agricultural development shall use appropriate building materials, colors, landscaping and screening to eliminate or minimize the visual impact of the development.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>MidPen prepared an aesthetics report (Stevens Consulting 2020a) that analyzed the effects of the proposed project on views from SR 1, which concluded that due to intervening elevation and geography, the project could not be seen from SR 1, the only scenic road in the vicinity of the project site. Primary public views from this portion of SR 1 are of the ocean, and the proposed project site is located on the opposite side of SR 1 from the ocean, so it would not affect any public views. There are no public recreation areas or trails in the vicinity of the project site. The project does not involve the enlargement of existing structures.</p>

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
b. Require, including by clustering if necessary, that new parcels have building sites that are not visible from State and County Scenic Roads and will not significantly impact views from other public viewpoints. If the entire property being subdivided is visible from State and County Scenic Roads or other public viewpoints, then require that new parcels have building sites that minimize visibility from those roads and other public viewpoints.	Yes	See response to Policy 8.5 above.
<b>Natural Features – Vegetative Forms</b>		
<b>8.9 Trees</b>		
a. Locate and design new development to minimize tree removal.	Yes	The project site has scattered Monterey Pine and Monterey Cypress trees, with a forest of these trees along the northern boundary of the project site. It does not contain any trees protected by County policy While it is currently unknown how many trees will need to be removed, the proposed housing development is clustered on the site to retain the forested open space on the northern portion of the project site. All existing trees to be retained on the project site will be fenced during construction and provided with temporary irrigation.
b. Employ the regulations of the Significant Tree Ordinance to protect significant trees (38 inches or more in circumference) which are located in urban areas zoned Design Review (DR).	Yes	No Significant Trees have been identified on the project site.
c. Employ the regulations of the Heritage Tree Ordinance to protect unique trees which meet specific size and locational requirements.	Yes	MidPen prepared a biological resources report (De Novo 2020) that evaluated the biological resources on the project site. No heritage trees, significant trees, unique trees, or other important trees were identified on the portion of the project site where development would occur. Therefore, no significant trees will be removed due to construction of the proposed project.
d. Protect trees specifically selected for their visual prominence and their important scenic or scientific qualities.	Yes	The forested open space on the northern portion of the project site would be protected during construction and retained on the project site.

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
e. Prohibit the removal of trees in scenic corridors except by selective harvesting which protects the existing visual resource from harmful impacts or by other cutting methods necessary for development approved in compliance with LCP policies and for opening up the display of important views from public places, i.e., vista points, roadways, trails, etc.	Yes	The project site is located within the SR 1 scenic corridor. MidPen prepared an aesthetics report that analyzed the effects of the proposed project on views from SR 1 (Stevens Consulting 2020a, which concluded that due to intervening elevation and geography, the project could not be seen from SR 1, the only scenic road in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, no trees visible from a scenic corridor would be removed.
f. Prohibit the removal of living trees in the Coastal Zone with a trunk circumference of more than 55 inches measured 4 1/2 feet above the average surface of the ground, except as may be permitted for development under the regulations of the LCP, or permitted under the Timber Harvesting Ordinance, or for reason of danger to life or property.	Yes	As described under Policy 8.9(c) above, no heritage trees, significant trees, unique trees, or other important trees were identified on the project site, including trees with a circumference of more than 55 inches. Therefore, no such trees would be removed as a result of construction of the proposed project.
g. Allow the removal of trees which are a threat to public health, safety, and welfare.	Yes	To date, no trees on the project site have been identified as a threat to public health or safety.
<p><b>8.10 Vegetative Cover (with the exception of crops grown for commercial purposes)</b></p> <p>Replace vegetation removed during construction with plant materials (trees, shrubs, ground cover) which are compatible with surrounding vegetation and is suitable to the climate, soil, and ecological characteristics of the area.</p>	Yes	<p>Although MidPen has not yet developed a detailed landscaping plan for the proposed project, they have developed a conceptual plan which includes the following specifications:</p> <p>The landscape design for the Cypress Point affordable housing development will be drawn from coastal inspiration.</p> <p>Existing trees and shrubs that are to remain on site will be protected during construction. All existing trees to remain shall be fenced with a 6' tall chain link fence at the drip line of the tree. Temporary irrigation will be provided. No grading or other impacts under the tree canopy will be accepted.</p> <p>Plant materials to be used will include low maintenance, water conserving, native and adaptive vegetation selected for project use.</p> <p>Compliance with this policy and appropriate conditions of approval will be further determined during the design review process.</p>



Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b><i>Structural and Community Features-Urban Areas and Rural Service Centers</i></b>		
<b>8.12 General Regulations</b>		
<p>a. Apply the Design Review (DR) Zoning District to urban areas of the Coastal Zone</p> <p>(2) For all other development, apply the design standards contained in Section 6565.17 and the design criteria set forth in the Community Design Manual.</p>	Yes	<p>When MidPen is ready to submit a Coastal Development Permit application to San Mateo County, the proposed project will be subject to review under a Planned Unit Development zoning, and so will receive detailed design review at that time. Consistency with the design standards contained in Section 6565.17 of the Community Design Manual will also occur at that time. Compliance with this policy and appropriate conditions will be further evaluated during the design review process. Final designs for the proposed project are not required at this stage of project approval, but such designs will be provided when MidPen applies for a Coastal Development Permit.</p>
<p>b. Locate and design new development and landscaping so that ocean views are not blocked from public viewing points such as public roads and publicly-owned lands.</p>	Yes	<p>As discussed in the aesthetics analysis prepared by MidPen (Stevens Consulting 2020a) the proposed project would not block any views from SR 1. Additional potential locations of sensitive viewers to the west include hikers on the California Coastal Trail and recreationists within the James V. Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. In the vicinity of the Cypress Point project, the California Coastal Trail is routed through the entrance drive of the Montara Water and Sanitary District office and thence to Vallamar Street. The views to the east from this Trail also are hampered by changes in grade and existing vegetation, neither of which would be modified by the project at this location. In the vicinity of the project, the area within the James V. Fitzgerald Marine Reserve is limited to the rocky shore at the base of 50- to 60-foot cliffs and adjacent ocean waters. Views to the east for visitors within the Reserve near the project site would be blocked by the cliffs. The aesthetics analysis concluded there would be no significant interference with scenic vistas as viewed from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies or roads.</p>
<b>8.13 Special Design Guidelines for Coastal Communities</b>		
<p>a. Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada-Miramar</p> <p>(1) Design structures that fit the topography of the site and do not require extensive cutting, grading, or filling for construction.</p>	Yes	<p>Final designs for the proposed project are not required at this stage of project approval, but such designs will be provided when MidPen applies for a Coastal Development Permit. However, as noted above, the proposed project would not block any views of the ocean or other scenic vistas from public viewpoints. The conceptual design for the project provides for buildings and an overall scheme that is in scale with the character of the surrounding setting.</p>



Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p>(2) Employ the use of natural materials and colors that blend with the vegetative cover of the site.</p> <p>(3) Use pitched roofs that are surfaced with non-reflective materials except for the employment of solar energy devices. The limited use of flat roofs may be allowed if necessary to reduce view impacts or to accommodate varying architectural styles that are compatible with the character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>(4) Design structures that are in scale with the character of their setting and blend rather than dominate or distract from the overall view of the urbanscape.</p> <p>(5) To the extent feasible, design development to minimize the blocking of views to or along the ocean shoreline from Highway 1 and other public viewpoints between Highway 1 and the sea. Public viewpoints include coastal roads, roadside rests and vista points, recreation areas, trails, coastal accessways, and beaches. This provision shall not apply in areas west of Denniston Creek zoned either Coastside Commercial Recreation or Waterfront.</p>		
<b>Special Features</b>		
<p><b>8.26 Structural Features</b> Employ the regulations of the Historical and Cultural Preservation Ordinance to protect any structure or site listed as an Official County or State Historic Landmark or is listed in the National Register of Historic Sites.</p>	Yes	The project site does not contain any structures listed as an Official County or State Historic Landmark or in the National Register of Historic Sites.
<p><b>8.27 Natural Features</b> Prohibit the destruction or significant alteration of special natural features through implementation of Landform</p>	Yes	MidPen prepared an aesthetics report that analyzed the effects of the proposed project on special natural features (Stevens Consulting 2020a), and determined that no such features exist on the project site. Thus,

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
Policies and Vegetative Form Policies of the LCP.		no such features would be destroyed due to construction of the proposed project.
<b>Scenic Roads and Scenic Corridors</b>		
<b>8.32 Regulation of Scenic Corridors in Urban Areas</b>		Final designs for the proposed project are not required at this stage of project approval, but such designs will be provided when MidPen applies for a Coastal Development Permit. At that time, the project will undergo design review, and a consistency evaluation with the Design Review Zoning Ordinance will be conducted.
a. Apply the regulations of the Design Review (DR) Zoning Ordinance.		
b. Apply the design criteria of the Community Design Manual.	Yes	Final designs for the proposed project are not required at this stage of project approval, but such designs will be provided when MidPen applies for a Coastal Development Permit. At that time, a consistency evaluation with the Community Design Manual will be conducted.
c. Apply specific design guidelines for Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton-by-the-Sea, Miramar, San Gregorio, and Pescadero as set forth in Urban Design Policies of the LCP.	Yes	Final designs for the proposed project are not required at this stage of project approval, but such designs will be provided when MidPen applies for a Coastal Development Permit. At that time, a consistency evaluation with the Urban Design Policies will be conducted.
<b>8.34 Uses Allowed in Designated Historic Structures and Historic Districts</b>	Yes	MidPen prepared a cultural resources report for the proposed project (Stevens Consulting 2018a). This report determined that there are no historic structures on the project site, nor is the project site located within a designated historic district.
a. In urban and rural areas, allow the following uses subject to a use permit: (1) single-family residential, (2) multiple-family residential, (3) schools, public and private, (4) libraries, (5) community centers, (6) conference centers, (7) clubs, public and private, (8) professional offices, (9) art galleries, (10) art studios, (11) museums, (12) shops and boutiques, (13) book stores, (14) country inns and hotels, (15) restaurants and cafes, and (16) bars.		
b. Use must be consistent with the resource protection policies of the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.	Yes	Consistency of the project with the LCP resource protection policy is included throughout Table 1.

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b>HAZARDS</b>		
<b>9.3 Regulation of Geologic Hazard Areas</b>	n/a	The proposed project is not in a geologic hazard area, per the San Mateo County General Plan Natural Hazards Map (San Mateo County 1993)
<b>9.6 Regulation of Development in High Risk Fire Areas</b>	n/a	The proposed project is not in a high risk fire area.
<b>9.8 Regulation of Development on Coastal Bluff Tops</b>	n/a	The proposed project is not located on a coastal bluff, as it is on the east side of SR 1.
<b>9.9 Regulation of Development in Floodplains</b> <sup>[SEP]</sup>	n/a	The proposed project is not in a flood hazard zone.
<b>9.10 Geological Investigation of Building Sites</b> Require the County Geologist or an independent consulting certified engineering geologist to review all building and grading permits in designated hazardous areas for evaluation of potential geotechnical problems and to review and approve all required investigations for adequacy. As appropriate and where not already specifically required, require site specific geotechnical investigations to determine mitigation measures for the remedy of such hazards as may exist for structures of human occupancy and/or employment other than those considered accessory to agriculture as defined in Policy 5.6.  “Hazards areas” and “hazards” are defined as those geotechnical hazards shown on the current Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Maps of the General Plan and the LCP Hazards Maps. A copy of the report of all geologic investigations required by the California Division of Mines and Geology shall be forwarded to that agency.	Yes	The proposed project is not in a geologic hazard area (San Mateo County 1993). MidPen prepared a geotechnical evaluation of the project site (Rockridge 2017) that evaluated the appropriateness of site soils and seismic conditions for the construction required as part of the proposed project. No major deficiencies were identified, but measures are recommended to mitigate for the noted minor deficiencies. MidPen will adopt all of these recommendations into their final design.
<b>9.11 Shoreline Development</b>	n/a	The proposed project is not on a shoreline and thus not in an area where shoreline protection is needed, as it is on the east side of SR 1.
<b>9.18 Regulation of Development on 30% or Steeper Slopes</b> a. Prohibit development on slopes of 30% or more, unless (1) no alternative	n/a	The project site contains areas with 30% or greater slope, notably the forested area on the northern edge of the property. However, no development will

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p>exists or (2) the only practicable alternative site is on a skyline or ridgeline. Parcels shall not be created where the only building site, in whole or in part, including roads and driveways, is on a slope of 30% or more.</p> <p>An engineering geologic report shall be required for any development on a slope of 30% or more. Development less than 10 feet in height that does not constitute a building, road or driveway, or require grading shall be exempt from the application of this provision.</p>		take place on portions of the site with slopes greater than 30%.
b. Employ the siting and grading criteria of the Design Review Zoning Ordinance and the Community Design Manual for Development on Slopes 30% or Greater.	n/a	See response to Policy 9.18.a above.
<b><i>Development Standards for Protecting Fragile Resources</i></b>		
<b>10.25 Access Trails in Fragile Resource Areas</b>	n/a	The proposed project does not include access trails in fragile resources, as defined by Policy 10.24: (1) exposed rocky cliff faces, steep slopes as defined in the Hazards Component, and hilly coastal terraces (e.g., San Pedro Bluff and Devil’s Slide), (2) all sensitive habitats defined in the Sensitive Habitats Component, and archaeological/ paleontological resources.
<b>SHORELINE ACCESS</b>		
No policies pertain to the proposed project.		
<b>RECREATION/VISITOR SERVING FACILITIES</b>		
<b><i>Permitted Uses and Locations</i></b>		
<b>11.18 Sensitive Habitats</b>	Yes	MidPen prepared a biological resources assessment for the project site (De Novo 2020), which included searches of on-line resource databases, and several complete surveys of the project site for Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA), as defined in the Coastal Act. This assessment concluded:  Due to the absence of any ESHAs, as defined by the San Mateo LCP, on the project site, or any other sensitive habitats as defined under CEQA,
a. Conduct studies by a qualified person agreed by the County and the applicant during the planning and design phases of facilities located within or near sensitive habitats and archaeological/paleontological resources to determine the least disruptive locations for improvements and the methods of construction. These studies should consider the		

Table 1 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Relevant San Mateo County Local Coast Program Policies		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
appropriate intensity of use, improvements and management to protect the resources and reduce or mitigate impacts.		<p>implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on these resources.</p> <p>As indicated above under the assessment of <i>Policy 1.25</i>, MidPen prepared a cultural resources study (Stevens Consulting 2018a) that evaluated archaeological, historical, and paleontological resource on the project site. This study concluded that no known significant cultural resources are present on the project site, though unknown subsurface resources could be present. The report recommended mitigation to protect any such resources encountered during project construction.</p>
b. Provide improvements and management adequate to protect sensitive habitats. These may include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) informative displays, brochures, and signs to minimize public intrusion and impact, (2) organized tours of sensitive areas, (3) landscaped buffers or fences, and (4) staff to maintain improvements and manage the use of sensitive habitats.	Yes	See response to Policy 11.18 above.
<b>COMMERCIAL FISHING/RECREATIONAL BOATING</b>		
No policies pertain to the proposed project.		

*Source: County of San Mateo, 2013; Stevens Consulting, 2018a.*

## 2. SAN MATEO COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE

The County of San Mateo Zoning Regulations (Zoning Regulations) serve as the County’s zoning ordinance to promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, convenience and general welfare, in addition to the following:

- (a) To guide, control, and regulate the future growth and development of San Mateo County;
- (b) To protect the character and the social and economic stability of agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, and other private and public areas within the County, and to assure the orderly and beneficial development of such areas;
- (c) To obviate the menace to the public safety resulting from the locating of buildings, and the use thereof, and the use of land, adjacent to streets and highways which are a part of the Streets and Highway Plan Unit of the Master Plan of the County, or which are

important thoroughfares, in such manner as to cause interference with existing or prospective traffic movements on said streets and highways;

- (d) To provide adequate light, air, privacy, and convenience of access to property; and to secure safety from fire, inundation, and other dangers; and
- (e) To prevent overcrowding the land and prevent undue congestion of population.

The Zoning Regulations for the project area were first adopted in 1957 and have been amended through December 2017. Relevant LCP sections of the Zoning Ordinance are included in Table 2 below.

<b>Table 2 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with San Mateo County Zoning Ordinance</b>		
<b>Objective or Policy</b>	<b>Consistency</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<p><b>Section 6328.4. Requirement for Coastal Development Permit</b></p> <p>Except as provided by Section 6328.5, any person, partnership, corporation or state or local government agency wishing to undertake any project, as defined in Section 6328.3(r), in the “CD” District, shall obtain a Coastal Development Permit in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter, in addition to any other permit required by law. Development undertaken pursuant to a Coastal Development Permit shall conform to the plans, specifications, terms and conditions approved or imposed in granting the permit.</p>	Yes	MidPen is seeking an amendment to the LCP to accommodate a reduced development density. Following that approval, MidPen will apply for a Coastal Development Permit for the proposed project.

*Source: County of San Mateo, 2018; Stevens Consulting, 2018.*

### 3. CALIFORNIA COASTAL ACT

The California Coastal Act mandates the California Coastal Commission to “protect, conserve, restore, and enhance” the state’s coastal resources. Relevant Policies from Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act are included in Table 3 below.

<b>Table 3 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act</b>		
<b>Objective or Policy</b>	<b>Consistency</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<b>ARTICLE 5: LAND RESOURCES</b>		
<p><b>Section 30240 Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas; Adjacent Developments</b></p> <p>(a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses</p>	Yes	MidPen prepared a biological resources assessment of the project site (De Novo 2020), which included searches of on-line resource databases, and a complete survey of the project site for Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas

Table 3 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.		(ESHA), as defined in the Coastal Act. This assessment concluded:  “Due to the absence of any ESHAs, as defined by the San Mateo LCP, on the project site, or any other sensitive habitats as defined under CEQA, implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on these resources.”
(b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas.	Yes	While an ESHA (Montara Creek) lies north of the project site, no project activities would affect this resource, as no development would occur on the northern portion of the project site that drains directly to Montara Creek, and the project is including measures such as bioretention areas to ensure that stormwater from the project site after the project is constructed does not increase compared to pre-project conditions and that pollutants in that stormwater are filtered out.
<b>Section 30244. Archaeological or Paleontological Resources</b>  Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.	Yes	MidPen prepared a cultural resources assessment of the Cypress Point project site, which included surveys of the project site for archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources. As indicated above under the assessment of LCP <i>Policy 1.25</i> (see Table 1), this study found a midden site (CA-SMA-431), which, after testing, was found to likely be a midden site, consisting of mussel shell fragments left behind by indigenous people from the area. However, the site was determined to be either highly disturbed or to have been imported, so was not found to be significant using CEQA criteria. However, because undisturbed portions of the project site are considered sensitive for the occurrence of subsurface cultural materials, mitigation is recommended that would require monitoring during ground-disturbing activities within those sensitive areas.
<b>ARTICLE 6: DEVELOPMENT</b>		
<b>Section 30211. Development Not to Interfere with Access</b>  Development shall not interfere with the public’s right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization, including, but not limited to,	Yes	The proposed project is located on the east side of SR 1, so it would not interfere with the public’s access to the coast.



Table 3 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation.		
<p><b>30212. New Development Projects</b></p> <p>(a) Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, (2) adequate access exists nearby, or (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated accessway shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway.</p>	Yes	The proposed project is located on the east side of SR 1, so it would not interfere with the public's access to the coast. Project residents would have the ability to access the coast using the existing public coastal access located across 16 <sup>th</sup> Street (Montara Lighthouse).
<p><b>30214. IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC ACCESS POLICIES; LEGISLATIVE INTENT</b></p> <p>(a) The public access policies of this article shall be implemented in a manner that takes into account the need to regulate the time, place, and manner of public access depending on the facts and circumstances in each case including, but not limited to, the following:</p> <p>(1) Topographic and geologic site characteristics.</p> <p>(2) The capacity of the site to sustain use and at what level of intensity.</p> <p>(3) The appropriateness of limiting public access to the right to pass and repass depending on such factors as the fragility of the natural resources in the area and the proximity of the access area to adjacent residential uses.</p> <p>(4) The need to provide for the management of access areas so as to protect the privacy of adjacent property owners and to protect the aesthetic values of the area by providing for the collection of litter.</p> <p>(b) It is the intent of the Legislature that the public access policies of this article be carried out in a reasonable manner that</p>	Yes	The proposed project would neither block existing coastal access, nor provide new coastal access.



Table 3 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p>considers the equities and that balances the rights of the individual property owner with the public’s constitutional right of access pursuant to Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution. Nothing in this section or any amendment thereto shall be construed as a limitation on the rights guaranteed to the public under Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution.</p> <p>(c) In carrying out the public access policies of this article, the commission and any other responsible public agency shall consider and encourage the utilization of innovative access management techniques, including, but not limited to, agreements with private organizations which would minimize management costs and encourage the use of volunteer programs.</p>		
<p><b>30223. Upland Areas</b></p> <p>Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible.</p>	Yes	<p>The proposed project is located on an upland area, but this site is not required to support coastal recreation uses, as it is located on the east side of SR 1. However, a portion of the site would remain undeveloped and available for informal recreation use by residents and the general public.</p>
<p><b>30243. Productivity of Soils and Timberlands; Conversions</b></p> <p>The long-term productivity of soils and timberlands shall be protected, and conversions of coastal commercial timberlands in units of commercial size to other uses or their division into units of noncommercial size shall be limited to providing for necessary timber processing and related facilities.</p>	Yes	<p>The proposed project site is not a designated timberland and does not contain timber resources (Stevens Consulting 2020b).</p>
<p><b>Section 30250 Location; Existing Developed Area</b></p> <p>(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services</p>	Yes	<p>The Cypress Point project is an affordable housing project located directly adjacent to an existing residential neighborhood in Moss Beach. It is proposed on a parcel designated for affordable housing in the LCP. Public facilities are available at the site, which is within an existing neighborhood served by public facilities and services, including water, sewer, gas, and electricity, fire, sheriff, hospitals, and schools. Water and sewer capacity are reserved for the</p>

Table 3 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels.		proposed project, because it is a priority use (affordable housing) in the LCP. The project would not have any significant impacts on coastal resources that could not be reduced to less than significant with recommended mitigation measures, as documented in the Biological Resources Report (De Novo 2020), Cultural Resources Report, Visual Resources Report, and the Applicant’s Preliminary Environmental Evaluation Information Report.
<p><b>Section 30251 Scenic and Visual Qualities</b></p> <p>The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.</p>	Yes	MidPen prepared an Aesthetics and Visual Resources report (Stevens Consulting 2020a) to evaluate the effects of the proposed project on visual resources. The report concluded that the proposed project was not visible from SR 1, would not block any views of the ocean, and would not alter any important natural land forms. The project site is not in a highly scenic area, and is not designated as such in the Department of Parks and Recreation California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan (CDPR 1972). Further, the proposed project would be compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
<p><b>Section 30252 Maintenance and Enhancement of Public Access</b></p> <p>The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not</p>	Yes	The proposed project is located on the east side of SR 1, and thus would not interfere with coastal access. It would enhance access to the coast for residents of the project by its location within walking distance to the coastline. Further, MidPen is working with San Mateo County and Caltrans to improve pedestrian safety in crossing SR 1 from the project site, and is working with San Mateo County and SamTrans to improve access to transit service for project residents and the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed project is located within walking distance of commercial facilities in Moss Beach. The project site plan provides walking facilities to allow pedestrian circulation within the development. It also provides parking in excess of County and industry standards. The proposed project is not a high-rise office building, but MidPen and San Mateo County are working with SamTrans to provide safer

Table 3 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<p>overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.</p>		<p>access to its service for residents of the project. Finally, the proposed project would not overload nearby coastal recreation areas.</p>
<p><b>Section 30253. Minimization of Adverse Impacts</b></p> <p>New development shall do all of the following:</p> <p>(a) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.</p>	Yes	<p>MidPen prepared a geotechnical report (Rockridge 2017), which concluded that the project site does not present a significant geologic risk. The project site is not subject to flooding due to its elevation, and the distance to the nearest waterway (Montero Creek). The project site is not within a designated Hazardous Fire Area; however, the project site is located within a Community at Risk zone according to the County’s Wildland Urban Interface Fire Threatened Communities Map. New residential structures constructed as part of the proposed project would include fire-resistant features that conform to modern fire and building codes, as well as fire detection or extinguishing systems.</p>
<p>(b) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.</p>	Yes	<p>The proposed project is not on being constructed on a steeply (&gt;30%) sloped portion of the property, and per County requirements, is being designed to minimize runoff and erosion. It would not alter any significant natural landforms, not would it be located along bluffs or cliffs.</p>
<p>(c) Be consistent with requirements imposed by an air pollution control district or the State Air Resources Board as to each particular development.</p>	Yes	<p>Permits from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District are not required for the proposed project, but MidPen will implement the best management practices recommended by the BAAQMD to reduce particulate matter emissions during project construction (I&amp;R 2018). No permits are required from the Air Resources Board.</p>
<p>(d) Minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled.</p>	Yes	<p>The proposed project will meet State of California energy efficiency standards. In addition, the proposed project includes a variety of energy and water-efficiency features (described in detail in <i>Introduction and Project Description</i> [Stevens Consulting 2020c]), including: provision of natural cross-ventilation of every unit; installation of high-efficacy lighting fixtures; use of cool roofs; installation of low-flow plumbing fixtures; and use of drought-tolerant landscaping.</p>

Table 3 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
		The proposed project may reduce vehicle miles traveled by providing an initial leasing preference for 75% of the units for workers in the MidCoast area, allowing them to find affordable housing in the region, rather than commuting in from elsewhere, and by including secure bike parking facilities.
(e) Where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods that, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.	Yes	The project site is not a special community or destination for recreational uses.
<p><b>Section 30254.5 Terms or Conditions on Sewage Treatment Plant Development; Prohibition</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the commission may not impose any term or condition on the development of any sewage treatment plant which is applicable to any future development that the commission finds can be accommodated by that plant consistent with this division. Nothing in this section modifies the provisions and requirements of Sections 30254 and 30412.</p>	n/a	The proposed project does not involve the development of a sewage treatment plant, nor does the project require the development of such a plant. In fact, sewage capacity for the proposed project is reserved per the LCP, because the proposed project is a priority use (affordable housing).
<p><b>Section 30255 Priority of Coastal-Dependent Developments</b></p> <p>Coastal-dependent developments shall have priority over other developments on or near the shoreline. Except as provided elsewhere in this division, coastal-dependent developments shall not be sited in a wetland. When appropriate, coastal-related developments should be accommodated within reasonable proximity to the coastal-dependent uses they support.</p>	Yes	The proposed project is not a coastal-dependent development, but neither is it located on the shoreline; it is located inland across SR 1.
<p><b>30600. Coastal Development Permit; Procedures Prior to Certification of Local Coastal Program</b></p> <p>(a) Except as provided in subdivision (e), and in addition to obtaining any other permit required by law from any local government or from any state, regional, or local agency, any person, as defined in Section 21066, wishing to perform or undertake any development in the coastal zone, other than a facility subject to Section 25500, shall obtain a coastal</p>	Yes	The Applicant will apply to San Mateo County for a Coastal Development Permit following approval of the LCP Amendment.

Table 3 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
development permit. (d) After certification of its local coastal program or pursuant to the provisions of Section 30600.5, a coastal development permit shall be obtained from the local government as provided for in Section 30519 or Section 30600.5.		

*Source: Public Resources Code Division 20: California Coastal Act, 2018.*

## 4. MONTARA-MOSS BEACH-EL GRANADA COMMUNITY PLAN

Within San Mateo County, Area plans, also known as community or neighborhood plans, serve to guide decisions about the physical development of a given community or district. These plans allow for specific, local application of the more broad based policies contained in the County of San Mateo General Plan. Because Government Code Section 65301(b) allows for the adoption of the General Plan as either a single document or a group of documents relating to geographic segments of the planning area, area plans are considered part of the General Plan.

In 1978, the San Mateo County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors approved the Montara-Moss Beach- El Granada Community Plan. The Community Plan formed the basis and was incorporated by reference into San Mateo County’s LCP, adopted in 1980. The Community Plan addresses issues pertaining to land use, transportation, conservation and open space, parks and recreation, and infrastructure (including community facilities, public services and community appearance). Relevant policies of the Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan are included in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with the Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b>GENERAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES</b>		
<b>1.2 Design Characteristics</b> Encourage good design in new construction which reflects the character, and is compatible with the scale of the neighborhood in which it is located.	Yes	The proposed project would involve the construction of 71 units of new affordable housing at a density similar to the surrounding neighborhood. The project is limited to two-story structures that have been modified in response to community comments to fit within the scale of the surrounding neighborhood, and would be subject to future design review; the project will comply with all applicable design standards and guidelines.

Table 4 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with the Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b>1.8 Housing</b> Accommodate a variety of dwelling styles within an economic range that serves the housing needs of the community.	Yes	The Cypress Point project will provide affordable housing for low income persons (defined as up to 80% of the local area median income).
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<b>Residential Land Use</b>		
<b>2.5 Location of Multi-Family Development</b> Locate multiple-family development adjacent to commercial centers as a transition to single-family development.	Yes	The site is defined as infill in the LCP, and designated as a priority development site for affordable housing in the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program Policies document. The proposed project is located on a parcel that is surrounded by surrounding residential uses and open space, and is near to commercial uses in Moss Beach.
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>		
<b>3.1 Circulation System</b> Develop a circulation system, and road standards for residential streets, which complement the small-town character of the community.	Yes	The project proposes internal circulation driveways and access ways.
<b>HOUSING</b>		
<b>4.1 Housing Design</b> Build housing that relates to its physical setting, does not destroy the natural features of the land, and is compatible with the neighborhood scale and coastal character of the community.	Yes	The housing associated with the proposed project would not destroy natural features and is considered to be generally compatible with the neighborhood scale and coastal character of the community.
<b>Provision of Housing</b>		
<b>4.4 Provision of Affordable Housing</b> Provision of housing affordable by low and moderate income families should be a priority of new residential construction, particularly if government subsidies are available.	Yes	See response to Policy 1.8 above.
<b>4.7 Compatibility of New Housing with General Plan</b> New housing should be consistent with the policies of the County General Plan, its elements, and the Local Coastal Program.	Yes	The consistency of the proposed project with the General Plan and Local Coastal Program has been discussed throughout this chapter.



Table 4 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with the Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b>NATURAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>5.1 Protection of Agriculture</b> Protect and enhance prime agricultural and open space lands within the community and maintain the existing balance between urban and open lands.	Yes	The project site is not comprised of prime agricultural land and is not designated open space. The project will protect and enhance the natural environment by clustering development on a portion of the site and preserving approximately half of the site as undeveloped open space.
<b>VISUAL QUALITY</b>		
<b>7.1 Preserving Community Character</b> Preserve and enhance the visual qualities of the coastal community which give it a unique character and distinguish it from other places.	Yes	MidPen prepared an Aesthetics and Visual Resources Report (Stevens Consulting 2020a) that assesses the impacts of the proposed project on visual resources, and concluded that the proposed project would not have any significant adverse affects related to visual resources.
<b>Urban Design</b>		
<b>7.2 Preserving Community Character</b> (a) Maintain community character and ensure that new developments are compatible with existing homes in scale, size and design.	Yes	See response to Policy 1.2.
(b) Maintain the small-town character of the area by preventing construction of massive structures out of scale with the community.	Yes	The proposed project would be constructed at a density similar to the surrounding neighborhood. The project would consist of two-story buildings with roof heights no more than 28 feet above the finished grade. Considering the elevation of the project site and existing on site trees to be retained, the project would not appear out of scale with the community.
<b>7.3 Preserving Natural Amenities</b> Preserve the natural amenities of the community through the appropriate location of new structures designed to harmonize with their surroundings.	Yes	The project will protect and enhance the natural environment by clustering development on a portion of the site and preserving approximately half of the site as undeveloped open space. The forested open space on the northern portion of the project site would be protected during construction and will remain undeveloped.
<b>7.6 Protection of Scenic Vistas</b> Preserve and protect scenic vistas of ocean, beaches, and mountains for residents of the community.	Yes	As discussed in Table 1 Policy 8.5, the project would not obstruct coastal views and impacts would be less than significant.
<b>Regulation of Appearance</b>		
<b>7.7 Tree Planting</b> Encourage the planting of trees along streets and walkways.	Yes	The conceptual landscaping plan includes maintaining as much of existing trees and shrubs as possible, and planting new vegetation along streets and walkways.

Table 4 Consistency of the Proposed Cypress Point Project with the Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan		
Objective or Policy	Consistency	Discussion
<b>7.8 Preservation of Landforms and Vegetation</b> Preserve existing landforms and vegetation.	Yes	The proposed project includes retaining the forested open space on the northern portion of the site. In addition, no development will take place on portions of the site with slopes greater than 30%
<b>7.11 Design Review</b> Apply the DR (Design Review) Overlay Zoning District in the urbanized areas of the community to regulate siting of structures, to protect natural features, and to provide for design compatibility with surrounding development.		The project is limited to two-story structures and would be subject to future design review; the project will comply with all applicable design standards and guidelines.
<b>7.12 Community Design Manual</b> a. Employ the design guidelines set forth in the Community Design Manual. b. Employ the guidelines of the Community Design Manual to ensure that specific site design is sensitive to the marine orientation of the community.	To be determined	The project will be reviewed for consistency with the Community Design Manual following application for a Coastal Development Permit and final designs for the project are completed.

*Source: Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan, 1985.*

## 5. SAN MATEO COUNTY COMMUNITY DESIGN MANUAL

The San Mateo Community Design Manual was created to provide guidelines by which the County Design Review Administrator may evaluate individual building permits where the Design Review Zoning District is combined with existing zoning districts.

Final designs for the proposed project are not required at this stage of project approval, but such designs will be provided when MidPen applies for a Coastal Development Permit. Therefore, at this stage of the project, a consistency evaluation with the Community Design Manual is premature.



## REFERENCES

- BKF, 2018. Cypress Point Hydromodification Management (HM) – Revision 1. BKF Job Number 20160074. April 27, 2018.
- California Coastal Commission, 2013. Staff Report: Public Works Plan Amendment Application. Amendment #2-06-006-A1. Montara Water and Sanitary District. Item W-19a. Filed October 18, 2013.
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. 1972. California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan. Accessed by Craig Stevens on April 30, 2018 at: <<https://archive.org/details/CaliforniaCoastlinePreservationAndRecreationPlan>>
- De Novo Planning Group, 2020. Biological Resources Assessment for the MidPen Housing Cypress Point Housing Project. Prepared for MidPen Housing. August.
- Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., 2018. Cypress Point Affordable Housing Project Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment. June 2018.
- Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (Kittelson). 2019. Cypress Point Traffic Impact Analysis, Moss Beach, California. Prepared for MidPen Housing. April.
- Kittelson. 2020. Update to Cypress Point Transportation Analysis. August.
- Rockridge Geotechnical, 2017. Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Affordable Housing Development, 16<sup>th</sup> and Carlos Streets, Moss Beach, California. June 8, 2017.
- San Mateo, County of. 2018. Planning and Building Department. San Mateo County Zoning Regulations. January 2018.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. General Plan, Overview Background and Issues; Map 15.1: Natural Hazards. November 1993.
- San Mateo, County of. 1985. Department of Environmental Management, Planning and Development Division, Area Plans Summary, Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan, 1985, page 3.1.
- Stevens Consulting. 2018a. Cypress Point Project, Cultural Resources Report. Prepared for MidPen Housing. July 2018.
- Stevens Consulting. 2020a. Cypress Point Project, Aesthetics and Visual Resources. Prepared for MidPen Housing. August 2020.
- Stevens Consulting. 2018b. Cypress Point Project, Public Services and Utilities. Prepared for MidPen Housing. July 2018.



# Coastal Commission Review Draft

Stevens Consulting. 2020b. Cypress Point Project, Supplemental Environmental Evaluation Report. Prepared for MidPen Housing. August 2020.

Stevens Consulting. 2020c. Cypress Point Project, Introduction and Project Description. Prepared for MidPen Housing. August 2020